

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/062,411	-	02/05/2002	Makoto Katsumata	Q68415 4108	
23373	7590	03/31/2003			
SUGHRUE	•			EXAMINER	
WASHINGT		IA AVENUE, N.W. 20037		ANDREWS, MELVYN J	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1742	
				DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003	

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•		HG
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
£		10/062,411	KATSUMATA ET AL.	
Offi	ice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Melvyn J. Andrews	1742	
<i>The M</i> Period for Reply	AILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
THE MAILING - Extensions of tin after SIX (6) MC - If the period for - If NO period for - Failure to reply - Any reply receiv	ED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESTANDING AND STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESTANDING AND STATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION THE MAY BE AND AND AND STATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNICATION THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNICATION T	DN. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thi eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communicati  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
1)☐ Respo	onsive to communication(s) filed on	·		
2a)∐ This a	action is FINAL. 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
	this application is in condition for a I in accordance with the practice ur claims			is
4)⊠ Claim(s	s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.		
4a) Of t	he above claim(s) is/are with	ndrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s	s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s	s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s	s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(	s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Pap	ers			
	ecification is objected to by the Exar			
10)∐ The dra	wing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ a	accepted or b)☐ objected to by	the Examiner.	
, ,	ant may not request that any objection			
•—	posed drawing correction filed on _		disapproved by the Examiner.	
	roved, corrected drawings are required			
12)∐ The oat	h or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner.		
Priority under 3	5 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13)⊠ Acknow	wledgment is made of a claim for fo	reign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All t	o)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
1.⊠ (	Certified copies of the priority docur	ments have been received.		
2. 🗌 (	Certified copies of the priority docur	ments have been received in a	Application No	
_	Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internationa attached detailed Office action for a	al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-	
	edgment is made of a claim for don			tion).
a) 🔲 Th	e translation of the foreign languago ledgment is made of a claim for dor	e provisional application has l	peen received.	,
Attachment(s)	<b>5</b>			
1) Notice of Refe 2) Notice of Draft	rences Cited (PTO-892) sperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946 sclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	3) 5) Notice o	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	. •

Art Unit: 1742

A

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Japanese patent No.2001-59120. The Japanese patent discloses a method in which

Art Unit: 1742

3

a composite material is heated and melted in a container then adding flux which releases the reinforcement from the mixture and the flux containing reinforcement levitates ( see Abstract) but does not explicitly disclose layers but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expect that layers would have been formed by the levitation. With respect to Claim 2 the concentration of the flux would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the flux concentration is a result effective variable. In re Antonie 195 USPQ 6.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "base metal" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melvyn J. Andrews whose telephone number is 703-308-3739. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V King can be reached on 703-308-1146. The fax phone numbers for

Application/Control Number: 10/062,411

Art Unit: 1742

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

mja March 24, 2003